



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,838	09/10/2003	John F. Gabower	020843-000410US	5171

20350 7590 11/28/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
----------

NGO, HUNG V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2831

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/659,838

Applicant(s)

GABOWER, JOHN F.

Examiner

Hung V. Ngo

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2005.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-34, 46 and 49-52 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 25, 26, 28, 46, 49 and 50 is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 24, 27, 29-31, 33, 51 and 52 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 32 and 34 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 24, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chow et al (US 5,243,126).

Chow et al disclose a shaped polymer substrate (4a, 4b) (col. 4, lines 38-65) comprising a metalized polymer substrate, a conductive material (5) made of aluminum on at least one surface of the shaped polymer substrate, wherein the conductive material has a thickness between 1-50 microns (col. 4, lines 30-40).

Re claims 29-31 the limitations of “thermoformed”, “recycled”, “vacuum deposited”, “reground”, “re-extruded”, have been considered, but does not result in a structural difference. The presence of process limitations in product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to that product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27, 33, 51, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al (US 5,243,126).

The teaching of chow as discussed above does not disclose the shaped polymer substrate has a thickness between 0.006 to 0.1 inches (re claims 27, 33) the conductive material made of copper, or nickel (re claims 51, 52).

Re claims 27, 33, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a specific thickness between 0.006 to 0.1 inches of the substrate of Chow et al, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Re claims 51, 52, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use copper, or nickel for the conductive material of Chow et al for intended purpose, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 32, 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 23, 25, 26, 28, 46, 49, 50 are allowed

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The limitation " polyvinyl chloride, polycarbonate, polybutylene terephthalate, or polyethylene terephthalate glycol" of claim 23, 32, "a peripheral flange" of claims 28, 34 in combination with other limitations present is neither taught nor disclosed in the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Communication***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean A. Reichard can be reached on (571) 272-2800 EXT 31. The fax

Art Unit: 2831

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HVN  
11-22-05

Hung V. Ngo

**HUNG V. NGO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**